

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 175 212

EC 120 165

AUTHOR Hasazi, Susan E.: And Others
TITLE Mainstreaming: Merging Regular and Special Education.
INSTITUTION Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, Bloomington, Ind.
PUB DATE 79
NOTE 48p.
AVAILABLE FROM Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, 8th Street and Union Avenue, Bloomington, Indiana 47401 (\$0.75)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Change Agents: Elementary Secondary Education; *Handicapped Children: Individualized Programs; *Legislation; *Mainstreaming: Parent Teacher Cooperation; *Teacher Role
IDENTIFIERS *Education for All Handicapped Children Act

ABSTRACT

The booklet on mainstreaming looks at the merging of special and regular education as a process rather than as an end. Chapters address the following topics (sample subtopics in parentheses): what is mainstreaming; pros and cons of mainstreaming; forces influencing change in special education (educators, parents and advocacy groups, the courts, federal policy and legislation); the intent of P.L. 94-142, the Education for All Handicapped Children Act (state requirements, local education agency requirements, zero reject model of education, individualized educational program, least restrictive environment, nondiscriminatory testing, and due process safeguards); roles and responsibilities of regular and special educators parent-teacher partnership (professional mishandling of parents and parents' mishandling of professionals); implications for the future (research); and gaining community support. (SBH)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED175212

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Mainstreaming: Merging Regular and Special Education

By Susan E. Hasazi, Paul D. Rice, and Robert York

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D. Kilewer

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC).

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 79-83629

ISBN 0-87367-124-4

Copyright © 1979 by the Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation
Bloomington, Indiana

EC120165



SUSAN E. HASAZI



PAUL D. RICE



ROBERT YORK

Susan E. Hasazi is a lecturer in special education in the College of Education and Social Services, University of Vermont. She serves as the special education book review editor for *Instructor* magazine and as an associate editor for *Exceptional Children*. She is chairperson of the research committee of the Burlington, Vermont, chapter of Phi Delta Kappa and president of the Vermont Coalition of the Handicapped.

Paul D. Rice is assistant superintendent for Special Services and Secondary Education, Supervisory Union #32, Lebanon, N.H. Prior to this position, he was supervising principal at the St. Albans City Elementary and Regional Special Education Center in Vermont.

Rice is a founder and charter member of the Burlington, Vermont, chapter of Phi Delta Kappa and was its first president.

Robert York is an assistant professor and associate director for the Center for Developmental Disabilities, University of Vermont, where he is involved with the delivery of interdisciplinary services to individuals with severe and multiple handicaps. He is also codirector of a Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, USOE, project involving inservice training of teachers and other professionals, development of curricula and instructional materials, and the design and evaluation of service delivery systems. York is editor of the *AAESP/PH Review*, a journal published by the American Association for the Education of the Severely Profoundly Handicapped.

Series Editor: Derek L. Burleson

This fastback is sponsored by the Kansas State University Chapter of Phi Delta Kappa, which made a generous financial contribution toward publication costs.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

What Is Mainstreaming?	6
The Pros and Cons of Mainstreaming	8
Practices Associated with Mainstreaming	11
Forces Influencing Change in Special Education	13
Educators	13
Parents and Advocacy Groups	14
The Courts	15
Federal Policy and Legislation	16
The Intent of Public Law 94-142	19
State Requirements Under P.L. 94-142	20
Local Education Agency Requirements	21
Zero Reject Model of Education	21
Individualized Educational Program	22
Least Restrictive Environment	26
Nondiscriminatory Testing	27
Due Process Safeguards	28
Roles and Responsibilities of Regular and	
Special Educators	30
Teacher Roles	30
Special Class Teacher Roles	31
Administrator Roles	32
Parent-Teacher Partnership	33
Professional Mishandling of Parents	34
Parents' Mishandling of Professionals	34
Implications for the Future	37
Research	41
Gaining Community Support	43
Bibliography	45

What Is Mainstreaming?

The practice of providing educational programs for handicapped student in environments that maximize contact with nonhandicapped peers has been referred to as mainstreaming. This practice reflects recent changes in attitudes about educating the handicapped that have resulted in federal mandates as well as court decisions requiring that handicapped students have access to social and educational opportunities that are afforded to their nonhandicapped peers.

Public Law 94-142, the Education for All Handicapped Children Act, enacted by Congress in 1975, requires that every handicapped child receive, at public expense, an education specifically designed to meet his unique educational needs. Further, the law specifies that this education must be provided in the least restrictive environment and that whenever possible, a handicapped child must be educated with nonhandicapped peers. Most proponents of mainstreaming agree that its goal should be to provide optimal social and educational opportunities but confusion arises over where these opportunities should be provided.

Although research in instructional methodology has increased considerably over the past two decades, it has not yet provided educators with the skills and knowledge to teach effectively *all* children within the regular classroom environment. Thus, it would seem more productive to view mainstreaming as a process rather than as an end. Conceptualized in this way, educational environments can be viewed along a continuum of physical and social restrictiveness ranging from sep-

arate, specialized environments where intensive education and treatment are provided, to regular classroom environments where individualized instruction is provided for all students including those with handicapping conditions.

The Pros and Cons of Mainstreaming

Mainstreaming, as with many educational reforms and innovations, has its opponents and proponents. While most of the concerned parties agree that it is the right of all handicapped children to experience a free, appropriate public education, there is frequent disagreement over what is appropriate for a given child. Both the nature and mode of service delivery have been sources of controversy in the implementation of mainstreaming. Some professionals and parents believe that the regular classroom should be the environment in which most special education services are provided, while others support the continuation of self-contained, administratively separate special classrooms.

The proponents of mainstreaming support their position on both social and academic grounds. First of all, they maintain that the segregation of handicapped children results in their stigmatization and exclusion from opportunities for social and academic interaction with nonhandicapped peers. Mainstreaming, then, offers the possibility of lessening the negative social consequences associated with being labeled as handicapped.

At another level, mainstreaming may have additional social benefits. If a major goal of public education is to promote the development of personal independence within the context of social interdependence and cooperation, it stands to reason that both handicapped and nonhandicapped persons are more likely to develop mutual understanding and respect the sooner they are introduced to the broad range of individual differences.

The case for mainstreaming is not based entirely on social considerations, however. There is evidence that, at least in the case of mildly handicapped children, they progress as well or better in the regular classroom as they do in a special class. In part, this evidence suggests that the regular classroom may provide greater motivation and opportunities to learn. It also suggests that our placement and classification procedures up to this time have been less than accurate. Many of the traditional testing devices that have played a major role in special education placement decisions have been shown to be culturally biased and discriminatory with respect to certain children from minority or socioeconomically deprived backgrounds. Therefore, changes in assessment and evaluation procedures will be needed if mainstreaming is to provide more appropriate learning opportunities for handicapped students.

There is opposition to mainstreaming. First of all, there is the question of the practicality of the approach. Critics of mainstreaming acknowledge the fact that the special education class has not been particularly successful from an academic point of view but take issue with the contention that mainstreaming has produced better results. They argue that the decision to dismantle the current system and replace it with another should be carefully considered and be based on clear empirical findings. Critics of mainstreaming have also voiced a number of other strictly practical concerns: Will the regular education system with its increased demands for accountability and individualization be able to accommodate the needs of the handicapped? How will regular classroom teachers receive the training to deal humanely and effectively with the problems of integrating students with a diversity of handicapping conditions? Will the resources be available to provide trained specialists to assist classroom teachers? Will principals and other administrators be able to generate positive support for mainstreaming from school boards and the community at large? These questions are difficult but important, and must be answered if mainstreaming is to become a reality. They represent a challenge to all educators but need not be a reason for opposing the implementation of mainstreaming. Our first concerns should be directed at understanding how the learning environment can best be arranged to promote the aca-

demic and social growth of the handicapped child. This is what mainstreaming is all about. Administration cannot be ignored, and the problems inherent in a major change in the educational system are real, but the needs of the child must always be the foremost consideration.

Practices Associated with Mainstreaming

Perhaps the greatest challenge facing educators today, as a consequence of mainstreaming, is the redefinition of roles for both special education and regular teachers. As greater numbers of handicapped students begin attending community schools, responsibility for developing and implementing educational programs must be shared among parents, regular classroom teachers, and specialists.

Traditionally, special education has been delivered primarily in self-contained settings by a teacher trained in a specific area such as mental retardation or learning disabilities. As a result of mainstreaming, the majority of children who have been labeled educably mentally retarded, learning disabled, and mildly emotionally disturbed will be attending regular classrooms in neighborhood schools for most of the school day. Classroom teachers who may not have acquired the skills and knowledge to teach these students effectively will need the assistance of specialists in designing, implementing, and evaluating instructional procedures. Special education teachers, who have previously operated within self-contained classrooms, will function more as consultants to regular classroom teachers. Their previously self-contained classrooms will be used as resource centers for children in need of intensive instruction for limited periods of time. Students with more severe handicaps, who have attended specialized, regional school programs with virtually no opportunities to interact with nonhandicapped peers, will be attending community schools with increased frequency. These students may spend a majority of the day in a resource

classroom receiving intensive special education from a trained specialist. However, whenever possible, opportunities will be provided for social and academic learning activities to occur with nonhandicapped peers.

Specialists such as speech and physical therapists, physicians, and psychologists are becoming an integral part of the educational team. Services once delivered in self-contained special classrooms or clinics are rapidly making their way into classrooms. It's not uncommon to observe specialists training classroom teachers and aides to implement intervention procedures that can be incorporated within the daily classroom routine.

Parents are participating with greater regularity in the design of educational programs for their children. When students are screened for eligibility in special education, parents are contacted and must give their approval before any test may be administered. Based on the results of the assessment, a team comprised of the parents, classroom teacher(s), special educator, and appropriate specialists develops an individualized education program designed to meet the specific needs of the child. All aspects of the program, including the yearly goals to be met and manner of service delivery, must be approved by the parents. Regular meetings to report progress and discuss possible changes in program are scheduled to provide parents and educators the opportunity to share successes and concerns.

The responsibility for insuring that each handicapped child receives an appropriate education is fixed within the local school district. Decisions regarding eligibility for and the delivery of special services must comply with a standard set of state guidelines approved by the federal government and local education agencies. Thus, school principals will have an increased involvement in developing and monitoring special education resources. To assist local districts in locating, identifying, and educating handicapped students, the federal government has required that a portion of the funds appropriated to the states as a result of Public Law 94-142 be allocated specifically for inservice training of administrators and teachers in local school districts.

Forces Influencing Change in Special Education

Over the past two decades, theory and practice in special education have undergone major changes. These changes have been the result of four powerful forces: educators themselves, parents and advocacy groups, the courts, and government policy and legislation. These various forces have acted together to produce rapid and profound changes in special education delivery systems.

Educators

Special educators themselves were among the first to question the way the special education delivery system was organized. In 1968 Lloyd Dunn, a leading authority in special education, questioned the efficacy of placing mildly handicapped children in special classes. The work of Dunn and others in the 1960s stimulated many forces within the profession that were gathering momentum.

Elementary and secondary teacher preparation programs began to include training for teaching children with learning problems. Research was being translated into practice in the development of more effective teaching strategies. The concepts of individualized instruction and heterogeneous grouping moved out of educational textbooks into regular classrooms. Improvements in assessment techniques assisted educators in more accurately describing and providing for the individual differences demonstrated by each child. Specialists such as speech and language therapists and guidance counselors assisted classroom teachers in developing and implementing instructional programs. Our schools began to open their doors and welcome paraprofessionals, parent volunteers, and high school-aged tutors. All of these

developments in regular education encouraged learning environments designed to meet the needs of each individual child. Teachers began to accept, and expect, wide ranges of skill levels within each classroom. Children learning to work together in spite of their differences was recognized as a worthy goal.

Our technology has advanced so that we now have the skills and knowledge necessary to educate most children within the public schools. The barriers to providing such a broad spectrum of education are largely attitudinal. Through increased knowledge about and experience with handicapped children, nonhandicapped children will hopefully learn one of the most important lessons our educational system can teach—the value and acceptance of individual differences.

Parents and Advocacy Groups

A leading parent advocate once said that her young handicapped child would be the light of her life if she didn't have to think about her child's future. Parents, faced with exclusion and uncertainty regarding the educational opportunities available to their children, have made a powerful impact on the educational system. Initially, these groups were formed to provide support for and encourage communication among parents of handicapped children. As a result of increased communication, concerned parents began to focus their attention and efforts on changing social policies. They no longer accepted their children's exclusion from educational opportunities because there were no programs available or was not enough money to fund appropriate services. Advocacy groups such as the National Association for Retarded Children launched public information campaigns that influenced state legislatures and eventually the courts.

Professional associations such as the Council for Exceptional Children provided a forum for special educators to broadcast their fundamental belief, "as that of recognizing every child as a unique composite of potential abilities and learning needs for whom an individual educational program must be designed." Further, the Council stated "that the purpose of special education was to enlarge the variety of educational programs for all children whatever their needs" (*Policy Statements of the Council for Exceptional Children*).

Parent-initiated court action and federal and state legislation have required that parents and educators work together to develop appropriate educational plans for each child. It is only through such joint efforts that the promise of mainstreaming will become a reality.

The Courts

Parent advocacy groups have been successful in bringing their case to the courts. In 1971 the Pennsylvania Association for Retarded Children (PARC) filed suit on behalf of 13 retarded children who were not receiving educational services. Thomas Gilhool, the attorney representing PARC, argued that "every child, every exceptional child, every retarded child, is capable of benefiting from an education. There is no such thing as an uneducable and untrainable child." The court, through a consent agreement, found in favor of PARC, thus establishing the principles of right to education, due process, and least restrictive environment. These three principles were to become highly significant in the ensuing development of special education and mainstreaming.

In the *PARC* decision relating to the principle of least restrictive environment, the court ordered that:

... access to schooling was to be accorded to all of those children within the context of a presumption that placement in a regular class is preferred to placement in a special class and placement in a special class is preferable to placement in any other program whether homebound, itinerant, or institutional.

In other words, the child must be educated within the closest approximation to the typical classroom as the child's particular conditions dictate. Placement options that allow for interaction with nonhandicapped children are required.

Another principle affirmed in the *PARC* decision was that of due process. This principle assures that parents must be involved in any decisions related to placement of their child. It requires that prior to assessment, program change, or service implementation, parents be informed and agree to the program for their child in writing. Further, it requires specification of a formal system for dealing with any disagreement in a child's program that should arise.

Later in 1971 the Federal Court in the District of Columbia ruled in *Mills v. Board of Education* that the right to an education is available to all handicapped children, not just the retarded. Further, in responding to the defendants (the board of education) who claimed that such action would be impossible given limited financial resources, the court said:

The District of Columbia's interest in educating the excluded children clearly must outweigh its interest in preserving financial resources. If sufficient funds are not available to finance all of the services in programs that are needed and desirable in the system, then the available funds must be extended equitably in such a manner that no one child is entirely excluded from a publicly supported education consistent with his needs and ability to benefit therefrom. The inadequacies of the District of Columbia public school system, whether occasioned by insufficient funding or administrative inefficiencies certainly cannot be permitted to bear more heavily on the exceptional or handicapped than on the normal child.

PARC and *Mills* were landmark cases, but current special education policies and procedures have been influenced by a number of other cases since 1970 as well. *Wyatt v. Stickney* established the principle of right to treatment. The court ruled that citizens residing in state schools and hospitals had the right to individually designed treatment programs including an education designed to meet their specific needs. Further, the court ruled that programs must be reviewed often and revised if necessary. *Diana v. State Board of Education* and *Larry P. v. Riles* questioned the procedures used to determine eligibility for assignment in special education classrooms. The defendants in both cases claimed that current practices were culturally biased and resulted in a disproportionate number of certain minority groups in special education classrooms. These two cases have resulted in injunctions against group testing, development of tests to measure more accurately achievement levels of minority group children, and parent consent prior to placement in special education programs.

Federal Policy and Legislation

The changes that have taken place in special education in the 1960s and 1970s could not have happened without the active involvement of

the federal government. While federal support for education of the handicapped goes back more than a century (Gallaudet College for the deaf was established in 1864), it was not until the late 1950s and early 1960s that significant federal support for special education was begun. The funding of the Cooperative Research Act in 1957, which was primarily aimed at special education research, is typically cited as the critical point in the history of government support for special education. In the 10 years following, a series of laws was passed extending research funding, providing support for teacher training, creating a network of university-affiliated research and training centers, and culminating in the creation by law of the Bureau of Education of the Handicapped in 1967. Throughout this exciting period in the history of special education, the influence of two prominent political leaders cannot be underestimated. John F. Kennedy, both as senator and President, consistently supported special education and brought its importance to the awareness of the American people. Likewise, Hubert H. Humphrey, throughout his political career, was a strong and faithful supporter of important legislation for the handicapped. The leadership of two men, both of whom had handicapped children in their own families, helped to set a climate conducive to federal level support that has continued to this date.

From 1974 to 1978 the impact of legislation upon special education has been profound. Public Law 93-380, the Education Amendments of 1974, guaranteed due process procedures in placement, nondiscriminatory testing, and confidentiality of school records. Further, it established the principle of least restrictive environment, which requires that to the greatest extent possible, handicapped children be educated with nonhandicapped peers. In November, 1975, Public Law 94-142, the Education for All Handicapped Children Act, was passed, expanding upon Public Law 93-380. This important law serves as a statement of national policy. Once and for all it insures that every handicapped child, regardless of handicapping condition, has the right to a publicly supported, appropriate education. To help attain this goal, Congress has provided the states with additional federal dollars to build a full continuum of services for all children.

As a result of federal legislation, the children in our public schools

represent a broader range of humanity than ever before. Edwin Martin, director of the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, quotes a "wise teacher" as saying "when people conceived the world to be flat, they feared sailing off the edge, but when they conceived it as round, exploration and discovery became possible" (Martin, 1973). Educators must now become explorers in researching, planning, and implementing programs for the handicapped.

The Intent of Public Law 94-142

The uniqueness of Public Law 94-142 and its enormous impact call for a detailed analysis of its provisions. One of the most interesting aspects of P.L. 94-142 is the detail provided by Congress to specify the intent of this legislation. Congress intended the law to "a) insure that all handicapped children have available to them a free appropriate public education which includes special education and related services to meet their unique needs, b) to insure that the rights of handicapped children and their parents are protected, c) to assist states and localities to provide for the education of all handicapped children, and d) to assess and insure the effectiveness of efforts to educate handicapped children" (*Federal Register*, 1977).

P.L. 94-142 actually evolved from several earlier laws, and in that respect, represents an attempt to organize past legislation and regulations into an integrated set of standards. This "standard setting" may be the most important aspect of the law, in that it provides detailed specification of practices for educating handicapped individuals. This should lead to a much more uniform and accountable system of education for handicapped children throughout the country. Thus, certain practices such as individualized educational planning and advance specification of instructional objectives are now requirements of all education programs serving the handicapped. Such practices have been recognized as exemplary for many years. However, the fact that these practices are now legal requirements insures that they will be implemented.

Congress intended P.L. 94-142 to demonstrate the increased federal commitment to providing full and appropriate educational services to handicapped children. This federal commitment has two important aspects; first, the more stringent monitoring of educational programs for handicapped children, and second, a commitment to an increasing federal share in the funding of special education programs.

State Requirements Under P.L. 94-142

To be eligible for federal assistance, state education agencies must submit an application or state plan that demonstrates that it has adopted an effective policy to insure all handicapped persons a free and appropriate public education. This appropriate public education must have been provided to all handicapped children between ages 3 and 18 by September 1, 1978, and must be made available to all handicapped children from 3 to 21 by September 1, 1980. However, in states where mandatory service to children ages 3 to 5 and 18 to 21 is not consistent with state law, the time line does not apply. States must locate, evaluate, and serve all handicapped children.

Each state plan must also include a description of a comprehensive system of personnel development and procedures for implementing that system. Training must be provided for both general and special education teachers and support personnel. In addition, information derived from educational research or demonstration projects must be disseminated to teachers and administrators of programs for handicapped children. Procedural safeguards must be established to insure that all handicapped children are educated in the least restrictive environment and that due process procedures are followed. Handicapped children must be educated to the greatest extent possible with children who are not handicapped. Placement in special classes, separate schools, or any other method of removal of a handicapped child from the regular educational program can occur only when the handicap of the child is such that education in regular classes (with use of supplementary services) cannot achieve satisfactory results. Due process procedures outlined in an earlier law, P.L. 93-380, were reaffirmed in P.L. 94-142, and place stringent requirements upon both state and local education agencies.

States are required to make specific provisions in their overall state plan for:

1. Record keeping and accountability for federal funds, including evidence that such funds are being used to supplement, not supplant, state and local funds.
2. At least annual evaluation of program effectiveness in meeting the needs of handicapped children.
3. Establishment of the state planning and advisory panel. This panel advises the state education agency on unmet needs, comments publicly on rules and regulations, and assists the state in developing and reporting such data and evaluations as may be needed by the U.S. Commissioner of Education.
4. Supervision of all education programs for handicapped children within the state regardless of the public agency actually delivering those services.

Local Education Agency Requirements

To receive funds from the state, local education agencies are required to submit an application with provisions to:

1. Assure that federal funds will be used to pay for the excess cost associated with special education.
2. Include procedures to identify, locate, and evaluate all handicapped children.
3. Establish policies and procedures to insure confidentiality of data.
4. Establish a goal and time lines for providing full educational opportunities to all handicapped children.
5. Describe the services, number of facilities, and personnel necessary to accomplish the goal.

The state educational agency has the power to withhold funds from local education agencies if those agencies fail to comply with these requirements.

Zero Reject Model of Education

With a zero reject model of education, all children, regardless of the degree or nature of their handicap, are provided a free appropriate

public education. The term *zero reject* was initially applied to services for mildly handicapped students. In this application, it discouraged the regular education system from rejecting mildly handicapped students. Within P.L. 94-142, the zero reject model of education has been broadened to mean that no individual, no matter how severely or multiply handicapped, can be rejected for service by the public school system. Inherent in the term zero reject is the requirement that the public schools must arrange their services to meet the individual needs of each handicapped student. It is the responsibility of the public school to make the necessary adaptations and program changes to accommodate individual needs.

Individualized Educational Program

The primary mechanism provided in P.L. 94-142 for insuring that each handicapped child receives an appropriate education is a written Individualized Educational Program (IEP). The written IEP is another attempt to assure that the best available educational practices are used to teach handicapped children. IEPs must be developed annually and are considered to be the shared responsibility of the local education agency and the child's parents. Parents are an integral part of the basic team that develops every IEP. This team must be comprised of all of the following:

1. A representative of the local education agency, other than the child's teacher, who is qualified to provide or supervise special education services.
2. The child's teacher or teachers who have responsibility for implementing the IEP.
3. The child's parents.
4. The handicapped child when his or her participation is appropriate.
5. Other individuals at the discretion of the parents or local education agency.

In addition, when a child is classified as handicapped for the first time, the evaluator or a representative familiar with evaluation must be included in the basic staff team.

The only exception to this intensive parent involvement in the de-

velopment of an IEP are those instances in which the parents refuse to participate. When this occurs, the public schools are required to provide documentation of their attempts to involve the parents. These records must be kept in considerable detail and should consist of reports of all telephone calls made to the parents and copies of letters sent to the parents' home or place of employment.

The content of the IEP has been outlined in P.L. 94-142 and the subsequent regulations published by the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped. The system was designed to be flexible so that its implementation could be adapted to local and regional needs. However, each IEP must contain the basic requirements listed below:

1. A statement of the present level of educational performance.
2. The annual goals.
3. Short-term instructional objectives with specific time lines for accomplishment.
4. The specification of the extent to which a child will participate in a regular educational program.
5. The dates during which the IEP will be applicable.
6. The procedures for evaluating the program's effectiveness.

Despite the fact that individualized instruction is a practice familiar to most educators, the specific requirements of P.L. 94-142 will be new to most teachers, administrators, and parents. Thus, some short-lived controversies over the format, content, and detail of IEPs appear to be inevitable. However, the development of IEPs will rapidly be recognized as an invaluable tool for all concerned parties. Specifically, the IEP concept will result in five major improvements in the education of handicapped children.

Advantages of the IEP. The first major improvement will be an increase in the tendency to view handicapped children as individuals. The need to develop an individualized educational program will require those interacting with a handicapped student to look beyond any categorical label imposed on that child. All parties involved in the development of an IEP will be required to look at an individual student's skills, the educational objectives that are most appropriate, the teaching strategies that should be used to achieve those objectives, and the evaluation criteria to determine the success of instruction. Thus, the

use of IEPs should increase respect for individual differences and recognition of the need to plan instruction around such individual differences.

A second major improvement will be the increased accountability that written IEPs will provide. Each student will have specific annual and short-term goals upon which his or her education will be focused. The presence of these goals will provide a basis for monitoring educational progress. This will allow parents and teachers to judge accurately the effectiveness of an individual student's program.

A third improvement of the IEP process stems from the requirement that this program be written. Each IEP will serve as a durable and consistent reminder of the plan for each child.

A fourth improvement resulting from the IEP process is its requirement that parents and educators jointly plan educational programs for individual students. This assures early and consistent involvement of parents in the planning, design, and monitoring of their child's educational program. The joint development of IEPs is an opportunity to utilize the knowledge of parents in designing educational programs for their children. As parents participate in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of the IEPs, better communication should take place between both parents and teachers. This will foster support for the educational services being delivered to handicapped children. As this system becomes widely accepted among parents and educators of handicapped children, it will likely spread to the general education system. Thus, we look forward to a period where parental involvement and support for the public schools is stronger than ever before.

The fifth improvement resulting from implementation of the IEP process is that assessment, program design, and evaluation will be done by an interdisciplinary group of professionals. This should result in a more comprehensive and higher quality educational program for each handicapped child. Thus, an individual with a severe disability might receive services from a physical therapist, a speech pathologist, an occupational therapist, an adaptive physical educator, and his own teacher. The results of this team work should provide a more comprehensive and higher quality educational program than ever before.

Disadvantages of the IEP. There are possible disadvantages to

implementing the IEP process. The first difficulty centers around the newness of the concept and the specifics of the law. Most teachers, administrators, and parents lack the training or experience necessary to implement smoothly an IEP system. Thus, many will require specialized training to prepare the first IEPs. These initial attempts in developing IEPs will result in some disagreements over the definition of appropriate programs. Once IEPs are developed, it will be obvious that an accompanying system to monitor and update them will have to be developed.

The initial development of IEPs will require new procedures and guidelines in working with parents. A revision of the usual schedule of parent conferences will be needed. Parents must begin working with the schools from the start of the school year and communicate more extensively with school personnel than ever before. This of course will cause some difficulties until the new procedures are learned and accepted by all parties.

Another problem that will be encountered in implementing the IEP process results from one of the strengths of this process: the team approach. As more individuals are added to educational teams, greater amounts of expertise are available to the school. However, this will require teachers, administrators, and parents to deal with a larger number of "experts and consultants." Thus the communication and organizational skills necessary to coordinate educational programs become more important. Larger numbers of interdisciplinary experts may lead to the use of an increasing amount of jargon from each profession. Often classroom teachers will be called upon to integrate the ideas and expertise of interdisciplinary staff into coherent and coordinated IEPs. Teachers will be required to assume the role of an educational synthesizer or resource manager in order to take advantage of the expertise focused on an individual handicapped child. The teacher and the parent will have the primary responsibility of insuring that this interdisciplinary expertise is translated into a quality IEP.

If the IEP process is to be smoothly implemented, administrators will need to lead the way. During the initial stages of the process, it will be necessary to set aside time for training of staff, development of IEPs, working with parents, and evaluating the IEPs that are developed.

However, once implemented, the IEP process should result in a more effective and efficient delivery of educational services.

Inservice Training. The development of IEPs for all handicapped children cannot be accomplished without providing training to current educational personnel. This need was so obvious that within P.L. 94-142 itself, inservice training is mentioned as a priority. Two types of training appear to be necessary. One type is short-term workshops where the IEP concept is introduced, examples are given, and individuals learn what an IEP is and how to write one. Such training is a beginning; however, it is unlikely that such training will be sufficient. A second type of training is then done within school districts by members of the special education staff. Such training will need to be ongoing in order to answer questions about specific individual programs. Special educators will be required to assume the role of trainer, consultant, or technical assistant, with their major roles being problem solving and providing assistance to teachers of handicapped students.

Least Restrictive Environment

Another important concept embraced by P.L. 94-142 and its subsequent regulations is that of least restrictive environment. This concept specifies that to the maximum extent possible, handicapped children should be educated with children who are not handicapped. Removal of handicapped children from regular school environments should occur only when the nature and the severity of the handicap is such that education in regular classes, with the use of supplementary services, cannot be successfully achieved. Placement decisions are the responsibility of the basic staff team and should be an outcome of IEP meetings. P.L. 94-142 insures that educational programs for handicapped students occur in settings that allow the greatest amount of individual freedom and exercise of human rights. School systems are required to monitor the restrictiveness of their educational placements and advance students from more to less restrictive settings whenever possible. This advancement is to be determined by each student's ability to function within less restrictive placements and not by the availability of such placements.

Regardless of the legal reasons for educating students in the least

restrictive environment, there are sound educational reasons to support this concept. Following their school experience, most handicapped individuals will reside within their home communities, participate in community activities, and work at community employment. Thus, it seems logical to provide education within a normalized setting. This should allow both handicapped and nonhandicapped individuals to learn from each other and live and function together throughout their lives.

Implementing the concept of least restrictive environment should result in a reduction of inappropriate educational placements. A few students will require educational placements that consist of home-bound instruction, residential programming, or programming within self-contained special classrooms. However, the vast majority of handicapped students will be in regular public school classrooms with nonhandicapped students or in classrooms adjacent to nonhandicapped students. Even the most severely handicapped students will mix with nonhandicapped students during assemblies, recess, and lunch. Mildly handicapped students will spend the majority of their school day within regular classrooms receiving specialized instruction as needed from special education personnel.

Nondiscriminatory Testing

P.L. 94-142 also attempts to rectify inappropriate procedures used in classifying children as handicapped. A variety of testing or assessment procedures must be used in determining whether a child is handicapped and must be administered in a child's native language. Parents must be informed of a school's intent to test their child and must give their permission before a determination of the child's handicap can be made. The evaluator must gather information from sources other than a single test. This information must include the child's current physical condition, his sociocultural background, and his adaptive behavior at home and in school. Great care must be taken to insure that all tests are fairly administered and the classification of an individual student is based upon a broad sampling of the student's skills and background information. Parents have a right to challenge the evaluator's findings and examine all relevant records. In fact, the rights of parents and chil-

dren have been extensively safeguarded by the due process procedures included within P.L. 94-142.

Due Process Safeguards

The P.L. 94-142 due process safeguards place stringent requirements upon both state and local agencies to make sure that the procedures they employ in dealing with handicapped individuals and their parents are fair and appropriate. The requirements of due process safeguards are as follows:

1. Parental consent must be obtained before an individual child can be evaluated to determine whether or not he or she is handicapped or to determine the nature of educational services needed.

2. Parents must have an opportunity to examine all relevant records regarding identification, evaluation, and educational placement of their children.

3. Parents may obtain an independent evaluation by a licensed or certified examiner and have it considered by the school system in determining the IEP for their child.

4. A parent surrogate must be provided for children who are wards of the state or whose natural parents are unknown or unavailable. This parent surrogate then assumes the responsibilities of the parent in obtaining a free, appropriate public education for the handicapped individual. The individual serving as a parent surrogate must be free from conflict of interest, have the knowledge and skills available to insure adequate representation of the child, and not be an employee of the state or local education agency responsible for providing services to the child.

5. Parents must be consulted about and receive written notice of any plans to initiate a change in the identification, evaluation, or educational placement of a child in an educational program. This notice must describe the proposed or refused action, a rationale for the school's decision, a description of all other options considered, and the reasons why other options were rejected. In addition, it must describe the evaluation procedure and other factors utilized to make the decision. The educational agency must insure that the parents understand the content of any written notice. Thus, written materials must utilize

language understandable to the general public and notice must be provided in the native language of the parent or translated orally when required.

6. There must be an opportunity to present complaints, and if those complaints are not satisfactorily resolved, an impartial hearing must be available. At a hearing the parents have a right to be represented by counsel, present evidence, cross-examine witnesses, compel the attendance of witnesses, and receive a written transcript of the proceedings and decisions. Since a hearing may be initiated by both parents and local education agencies, any party may utilize a due process hearing to resolve differences over an individual handicapped child's program. All hearings must be conducted within 45 days of the request of such a hearing unless all parties involved agree to an extension. While waiting for a hearing, a child who is the subject of that hearing will remain in his current education program unless all parties agree to an alternative placement. If the child is not currently enrolled in school, a public school placement will be made until the outcome of the hearing is determined. The findings of any hearing may be appealed to the state education agency for an impartial review. If either party is still dissatisfied with the outcome, a civil action may be filed in either state or federal district court.

Roles and Responsibilities of Regular and Special Educators

Maynard C. Reynolds, a leader in the field of special education, has characterized the current state of the field as undergoing a period of "renegotiation." This term refers to the changing roles and responsibilities of regular and special educators based on the needs generated by the right of each child to receive an appropriate education. In *Futures of Education for Exceptional Students: Emerging Structures*, Reynolds makes two observations relevant to the renegotiation of roles for regular and special educators: "1) When we expect people to act differently, we have to confront the limits and constraints imposed by their roles; and 2) Resources and support must be increased if organizations are to be permitted to explore with freedom." During the next few years, teachers and administrators will be expanding their existing skills in order to meet the challenge of providing each handicapped child with an appropriate education. There is little doubt that as expectations for teacher and administrator behavior shift, subsequent changes in their roles and responsibilities will follow. A description of emerging roles for teachers and administrators is presented below.

Teacher Roles

Classroom teachers will play a larger role in the coordination and planning of individual educational programs. This will require that they receive the necessary training to assist them in the development, implementation, and evaluation of educational programs. Edwin Mar-

tin, director of the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, reminds us that "concern for the integrity of the whole person . . . is necessary to make education special" (Martin, 1972). The classroom teacher, as the professional who spends the greatest amount of time with a given student, is in the best position to serve as a facilitator and coordinator of a student's total educational program.

To develop appropriate educational programs for each child the classroom teacher should demonstrate the technical skills to:

1. Define problems in observable terms.
2. Collect data to determine the student's present level of performance.
3. Specify instructional objectives for defined problem behaviors.
4. Develop intervention strategies to achieve the specified objectives.
5. Devise a method of ongoing evaluation to assess the effectiveness of the intervention.

As instructional managers, classroom teachers will coordinate the various resource services and personnel needed to implement an individual education program. Teachers serve as the major contact person with the home, thus providing parents with one familiar professional to deal with.

Special Class Teacher Roles

Special class teachers must demonstrate all of the technical and interpersonal skills specified for regular classroom teachers. In addition, they must acquire knowledge relative to the physical and behavioral characteristics of handicapped students in need of intensive special education. They must be able to utilize developmental and functional skill sequence in order to design, implement, and evaluate instructional programs. Further, they must demonstrate skills to manage the physical environment in a manner that allows for maximum independence for the part of each child.

As special class teachers begin to share their skills and knowledge with regular class teachers, they will need to acquire effective consultation skills. Advances in educational methodology have made it possible to improve teaching effectiveness dramatically. These innova-

tions must be communicated to classroom teachers in a way that will facilitate acceptance, adoption, and effective dissemination to the larger community.

Administrator Roles

During this period of renegotiation of roles, administrators are in a particularly critical position to influence outcomes. They must arrange the educational environment to insure that maximum cooperation between classroom teachers and resource specialists can occur. Adequate planning time and scheduled consultation time must be arranged to facilitate the appropriate utilization of resource personnel. Administrators are also in a position to encourage frequent interactions between school staff and parents. In schools where active parent participation has been encouraged, it is not unusual to observe community volunteers providing valuable educational experiences to handicapped students, both in the school and in the community.

The daily operation of the school will present new challenges to administrators. With more children with a variety of handicapping conditions in the school, adaptations in transportation, lunch, and scheduling will be required. Arrangements must be made to insure that handicapped students have opportunities to interact with nonhandicapped students in a positive manner. This might require an additional paraprofessional on duty during recess and lunch to encourage cooperative social experiences. It might require that special menus be available so a student needing a special diet can remain at school during lunch time. Such adaptations will require imagination and skill on the part of administrators. Finally, administrators must arrange for quality inservice training for all school personnel involved with teaching handicapped students. While professional staff should be involved in defining their training needs, it is the administrator who must coordinate and implement the inservice program.

Parent-Teacher Partnership

The importance of meaningful parent-teacher interaction has long been recognized in the field of education. Such interaction is even more important in the case of special education. Public Law 94-142 has formalized this interaction. However, there is no reason to believe that the law alone can bring about the kind of parent-teacher partnership needed if mainstreaming is to succeed. It is important to understand why this partnership is desirable and why it has not always been successful in the past.

As the first teacher in a child's life, parents occupy a critical role in social and cognitive development. Parents also carry the major responsibility for seeing to it that their child acquires the skills necessary for a productive, independent life that is both personally rewarding and contributes to society as a whole. Parents are usually the best advocates for their children and are also in the best position to articulate their children's needs and concerns.

In the past, relationships between parents of handicapped children and professionals have often been less than satisfactory. Misunderstandings between both groups have resulted in conflicts and dissatisfaction that make parents resentful and fearful and professionals defensive. Philip Roos, executive director of the National Association of Retarded Citizens, suggests a number of barriers between parents and professionals that must be eliminated before meaningful relationships

can exist. These barriers involve both the mishandling of parents by professionals and parental mishandling of professionals.

Professional Mishandling of Parents

1. *Professional Ignorance.* Many professional educators simply were not well trained in understanding or dealing with the wide range of handicapping conditions children may present. As a result, they may misinform or mislead parents inadvertently.

2. *Professional Hopelessness.* Some educators view handicapping conditions as if they were "incurable diseases." Parents who sense such a defeatist attitude may adopt it themselves or resent the educator who does.

3. *Referral ad infinitum.* A great many specialists may be involved in the education of the handicapped child. Referrals to specialists, even if appropriate, can confuse and frustrate parents if there is not a consistent source they can turn to for information in a language they can understand.

4. *Veil of Secrecy.* Many professionals have difficulty in communicating information about the child that may be threatening or disconcerting to the parent. The veil of secrecy that results may be more disturbing to parents, however, than the information itself.

5. *Deaf Ear Syndrome.* At times, educators have been guilty of disregarding parents' concerns or requests for information about their child.

6. *Professional Omniscience.* Professional educators often use terminology parents cannot understand when simple concepts would do. They exclude parents and children from the decision-making process out of a misguided belief that only professionals are equipped to deal with certain issues. Such an attitude can alienate parents and reinforce in them a sense of inadequacy.

7. *Parents as Patients.* All too often, the sorrow and resentment expressed by parents of a handicapped child are seen as evidence of emotional instability. Instead of receiving information about their child, parents are treated condescendingly or are offered counseling.

Parents' Mishandling of Professionals

1. *Unfair Expectations.* Some parents expect educators to have all

the answers and to take the responsibility of making all decisions regarding the child. Such an attitude is both unfair to the educator as well as unrealistic.

2. *Dishonesty.* At times, parents are not honest with educators or themselves about their willingness to assist in their child's education. If the professional is misled by the parents regarding their interest and ability to follow through with work at home, anger and disillusionment may result.

3. *Unwillingness To Listen.* Some parents may feel that their authority or integrity is threatened by professional advice. This attitude can lead to conflict between parents and educators and certainly prevents the parents from taking advantage of the educator's expertise.

4. *Unreasonable Demands.* Parents may demand unreasonable amounts of time and attention from educators. In their frustration with inadequate programs, they may attack the educator who is powerless to remedy the situation.

5. *Shopping Around.* Parents have been guilty of "shopping around" for a professional who will tell them what they want to hear. This creates defensiveness and alienates them from educators who are closest to their child.

To remove the barriers cited above, there must be open communication among all persons involved with the development of the individual educational program. Interactions should be frequent enough so that necessary modifications in the educational program can be made whenever appropriate. Although the law specifies that a review of the program must be made at least annually, it would seem that quarterly progress reviews would be in order if the program is to be continually modified.

Parents have a right to expect information about their child presented in clear, jargon-free language and in a noncondescending manner. When support services are needed, parents have the right to expect that school personnel will be familiar with available resources and assist in arranging for the necessary services. Parents have the right to inspect all written reports regarding their child. These reports should be written in language that is understandable and communicates a positive and realistic viewpoint. Written and oral communica-

tions that focus on identifying problems and generating solutions will likely result in positive outcomes.

Parents should expect to participate as members of an interdisciplinary team. The information they can provide regarding medical, social, and educational histories is essential to the development of an appropriate educational program. As the most frequent observers of a child's behavior, parents can often identify conditions under which learning seems to occur optimally. Further, parents should understand that the interdisciplinary team may be convened whenever there is new information to consider, and that no one educational program is final and unchanging.

When parents and professionals work together to create the best possible program for an individual child, a true partnership will prevail. Honest, two-way communication, characterized by mutual concern and respect, will help to create an environment where concerns can be discussed openly, solutions generated, and successes applauded and shared.

Implications for the Future

As Public Law 94-142 is implemented, public schools can expect to serve all of the children from their communities regardless of the degree of handicapping condition. Although estimates vary, this could mean that the typical school system can expect between 10% and 15% of its students to require special education services. The vast majority of these students will be only mildly handicapped, with less than 2% multiply or severely handicapped. As the regular educational system takes on greater responsibility for serving children with learning problems, much of the traditional special education system will become integrated into the regular elementary and secondary educational systems.

Public school systems will serve an even wider range of children and youth as they extend their service to younger (birth to 6-year-old) and older (18- to 21-year-old) students. Preschool programs will become more common, and children will be accepted into these programs regardless of handicap or cultural background. Including children at an earlier age will prepare the handicapped and the nonhandicapped for their future together in their school and community. Children will be screened early to detect developmental delays and any child determined to be "at risk" will receive special education services. These services will be provided by an interdisciplinary team and will include necessary parent education.

It is also possible that the public schools will assist in providing services for some individuals who exceed the age of 21. Since chrono-

logical age is not necessarily correlated with educational needs, some individuals, particularly those with severe handicaps, may remain within a teaching environment for some portion of their adult life. As long as an individual's primary need is to learn basic skills, the schools may be a part of the service delivery system.

Providing services to students with severe handicaps will also result in a broader definition of what constitutes education. For young children and individuals with significant handicaps, skills such as toilet training, feeding, and communicating basic wants and needs will become legitimate educational goals. Throughout the entire educational system, a greater emphasis will be placed upon developing skills that are functional in postschool environments, such as managing an individual budget or mastering the basic communication skills needed for social interactions.

The following brief case studies attempt to translate into reality some of the previous discussion about mainstreaming.

John—A student with severe, multiple handicaps who attends his local public school.

John attends the elementary school down the street from his home. Thus, John has seen and played with many of his fellow students as they grew up together in the neighborhood. Now, they all go to school together. John rides to school in his wheelchair in a small van, but that's a minor adaptation. At school, John is educated in a class with six other multiply handicapped students. He receives much of his basic instruction from the teacher and a teacher aide that works in his class. However, he does spend his recess, lunch, and activity time with the other children in his school. The team that has developed a quality education program for John includes not only his teacher but an occupational therapist and a speech pathologist. These specialists have worked closely with both his parents and teacher to design, write, and implement his IEP. The training and consultation provided to the teacher by both these experts have given John the type of integrated program that he has needed for years.

Barbara—A student with mild learning handicaps who attends the local public elementary school.

Barbara is an 8-year-old third-grade student who has experienced difficulty in learning to read since first grade. Her classroom in the local elementary school is heterogeneously grouped with children ranging in skill levels from first grade to fifth grade. The teacher is skilled in individualizing instruction as well as in arranging the environment to maximize cooperative learning experiences for small and large groups of students.

At the beginning of the school year, the resource room teacher and the classroom teacher worked together to assess Barbara's current level of performance. Most of the testing was done in the classroom as part of the daily routine. Testing was conducted in this manner to get a picture of how Barbara performed in the classroom environment over a two-week period. After analyzing the data on Barbara's performance, the parents, classroom teacher, and resource teacher decided that most of the remedial instruction could be carried out within the classroom. Together the resource room teacher and classroom teacher designed an individualized program that could be implemented by volunteer tutors from the neighboring high school. Barbara continues to participate in all of the regular classroom activities, but during the time scheduled for reading, she and another student receive 15 minutes of direct instruction from the high school tutor. The resource teacher meets with the high school student daily to review progress and deliver needed materials. Because the tutoring is implemented within the classroom, the teacher can observe and monitor Barbara's progress. The resource teacher works with Barbara at least once each week to evaluate her progress in order to prepare materials that she can work on independently in the classroom.

Barbara, like all of her classmates, receives instruction individually and in small and large groups. The classroom teacher utilizes parent volunteers, high school tutors, peer tutors, and resource specialists to increase the amount of direct instruction provided to all students. Barbara may not reach grade level in reading by the end of the year; however, she will progress to the next grade with the rest of her class. This will be possible because the fourth-grade teacher, in fact the entire school, is organized to allow for heterogeneous grouping. In this system, all students are assessed at the beginning of the new school year,

an individualized program is specified when needed, and special services are provided as appropriate.

Terry—A student with mild learning and behavioral handicaps who attends the local public high school in the mornings and works for a local small business in the afternoon.

Terry is a 16-year-old student who attends a local high school. Up until last year his attendance was irregular and his academic performance poor. He reads on approximately a seventh-grade level and had passed general math in ninth grade with a C average. His teachers reported that he was contradictory, verbally abusive to other students, and rarely completed assignments.

Over the summer a new resource room program was initiated at the high school. Students who read two or more grades below their expected grade level, had difficulty in written expression, or had not mastered basic math skills could spend as much as three periods a day receiving instruction designed to meet their specific needs. A team consisting of an English, a mathematics, and a social studies teacher developed and ran the program. There were usually no more than 15 students per period with one teacher and an aide. Students worked on packets of material that were prepared for them weekly. Each student who entered the program participated in the development of his or her own goals related to possible vocational activities.

Terry referred himself to the new program. He learned that the basic goals of the program were to increase basic skills and learn a vocational skill that would one day lead to full-time employment. One of the requirements of the program was for each student to negotiate a weekly academic contract that included activities in reading, consumer mathematics, and written expression. The academic work specified in the contract would be completed in the resource room during one or more periods. The afternoon was reserved for an on-the-job, work training program that the resource room staff and vocational education teacher arranged.

Terry was interested in farm equipment. He had lived on a farm all his life and recognized the importance of having well-maintained equipment. The local farm equipment dealer was looking for a person

to assist in machine repair work. He was willing to hire Terry half time at minimum wage and train him to service farm equipment. The resource room staff and vocational educational teacher arranged for Terry's academic contract to include instruction in skills that he would need in his new job. Terry now spent two periods a day in the resource room, one period in consumer math and one period in the vocational center. Terry's afternoons were spent at work learning to service farm machinery. A member of the resource room staff contacts Terry's employer weekly to receive input on Terry's performance. That information is used in developing the weekly contract.

Research

If the promises of mainstreaming are to be fulfilled, there are several areas of research that must be pursued vigorously in the coming years. Perhaps the single most important area for intensive research concerns the attitude formation process. For all children to benefit maximally from mainstreaming, teachers must work to create an environment in which handicapped and nonhandicapped children alike can develop realistic yet positive attitudes regarding one another. For the younger child, this may involve working on initial attitude formation; while for older children it may involve working on attitude change. There is rich research literature within social psychology on these processes, but the translation of this literature into programs and practices for the classroom teacher awaits careful study.

The challenge of the handicapped child in the regular classroom cannot be met fully without further research on the instructional process itself. In particular, there is a need for study of individualized instructional procedures. While the importance of individualized instruction has been well accepted within education generally and special education specifically, we are still a long way from determining what is the best integration of individual and group instruction. We also need further research on innovative instructional practices such as peer tutoring, which could greatly facilitate the mainstreaming effort. In this regard, the work of Johnson and Johnson (1975) on cooperative learning strategies serves as an excellent example of innovative instruction coupled with social acceptance.

Since mainstreaming will introduce handicapped children to teachers with little prior training or experience in special education, an important research priority must be given to teacher training at both the preservice and inservice levels. While work has begun in this area, we must push ahead as quickly as possible with sound evaluative research on this important topic.

Finally, the mainstreaming effort would benefit from research on basic competencies. The current concern in education with basic competencies has particular relevance to special education. While the relationship of mainstreaming to the basic competencies issue has not been fully articulated, the two areas may have much to offer one another and programmatic research exploring these relationships is needed.

Gaining Community Support

Schools today are faced with an increasing number of troublesome issues such as declining student enrollment, accountability, and minimum competencies. In attempting to develop and implement special education services for all handicapped students, the public schools face another set of challenges. These challenges require the involvement of the community as well as the cooperation of human service agencies that have traditionally assisted the handicapped.

The President's Committee on Mental Retardation reports that community support is an essential ingredient for building quality programs for the handicapped. It suggests that "the value of local initiative in public relations cannot be overstressed. Direct communication of information from and to people you know and trust is one of the most powerful wheels for influencing attitudes" (Nathan, 1976). A parent who has participated in a well-planned volunteer program, advisory council, or parent education program is in the best position to disseminate information to community members who otherwise might not have access to such information. Local citizens should actively participate in the development and evaluation of programs in order to increase community awareness and involvement.

Teachers, administrators, students, and parents all need increased opportunities to interact with persons with handicapping conditions. It is only through such direct contact that one learns that our similarities as human beings are far greater than our differences. Further, students and professional educators who feel comfortable learning and

growing with handicapped peers will generate those attitudes well beyond the boundaries of the school walls.

If mainstreaming is to fulfill its promise, our attitudes and behaviors must continue to evolve. A handicapped child must be viewed not as a separate category, but rather as one more unique and valued human being, willing and able to learn.

Bibliography

- Baumeister, A. A., and Muma, J. R. "On Defining Mental Retardation." *Journal of Special Education* 9 (1975): 293-306.
- Boggs, E. M. "Who Is Putting Whose Head in the Sand or in the Clouds as the Case May Be?" In *Parents Speak Out: Views from the Other Side of the Two-Way Mirror*, edited by A. P. Turnbull and H. R. Turnbull III. Columbus, O.: Charles E. Merrill, 1978.
- Bricker, D. "Educational Synthesizer." In *Hey, Don't Forget About Me! Education's Investment in the Severely, Profoundly, and Multiply Handicapped*, edited by M. A. Thomas. Reston, Va.: Council for Exceptional Children, 1976.
- Brown, L.; Wilcox, B.; Sontag, E.; Vincent, B.; Dodd, N.; and Gruenewald, L. "Toward the Realization of the Least Restrictive Educational Environments for Severely Handicapped Students." *AAESPH Review* 2 (1977): 195-201.
- Burrello, L. C.; Tracy, M. L.; and Schultz, E. W. "Special Education as Experimental Education: A New Conceptualization." *Exceptional Children* 40 (1973): 29-34.
- Diana v. State Board of Education*. Civil No. C-70 37 RFP (N.D. Cal., January 7, 1970, and June 18, 1973).
- Dunn, L. M. "Special Education for the Mildly Retarded: Is Much of It Justifiable?" *Exceptional Children* 35 (1968): 5-22.
- Egner, A., and Lates, B. J. "Case Presentation of the Vermont Consulting Teacher." In *Psychological Consultation: Helping Teachers Meet Special Needs*, edited by C. Parker. Arlington, Va.: Council for Exceptional Children, 1975.
- Federal Register*, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, August 23, 1977.
- Gilholm, T. K. "Education: An Inalienable Right." *Exceptional Children* 39 (1973): 597-610.
- Hasazi, S. "The Consultant Teacher." In *Teacher, Please Don't Close the Door: The Exceptional Child in the Mainstream*, edited by J. Jordan. Reston, Va.: Council for Exceptional Children, 1976.
- Johnson, D. W., and Johnson, R. T. *Learning Together and Alone: Cooperation, Competition, and Individualization*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1975.
- Jordan, J. B., ed. *Exceptional Child Education and the Bicentennial: A Parade of Progress*. Reston, Va.: Council for Exceptional Children, 1977.
- Kenowitz, L. A.; Gallaher, J.; and Edgar, E. "Generic Services for the Severely Handicapped and Their Families: What's Available?" In *Educational Programming for the Severely and Profoundly Handicapped*, edited by E. Sontag, J. Smith, and N. Certo. Reston, Va.: Council for Exceptional Children, 1977.

- Larry P. v. Riley. Civil No. C-71-2270, 343 F. Supp. 1306 (N.D. Cal., 1972).
- Lilly, M. S. "A Training-Based Model for Special Education." *Exceptional Children* 37 (1971): 745-749.
- Martin, E. W. "Individualism and Behaviorism as Future Trends in Educating Handicapped Children." *Exceptional Children* 38 (1972): 517-525.
- Martin, E. Speech delivered at Columbia University, 1973.
- Mills v. Board of Education of D.C. 348 F. Supp. 866 (D.D.C., 1972).
- Nathan, R., ed. *Mental Retardation: Century of Decision*. Washington, D.C.: President's Committee on Mental Retardation, March, 1976.
- National Association for Retarded Children. *The Educator's Viewpoint*. New York: NARC, 1954.
- Pennsylvania Association for Retarded Children v. Pennsylvania, 334 F. Supp. 1257 (E.D. Pa., 1971).
- Policy Statements of the Council for Exceptional Children as Established by the CEC Delegate Assembly. Reston, Va.: Council for Exceptional Children (no date).
- Reynolds, M. C., and Birch, J. W. *Teaching Exceptional Children in All America's Schools: A First Course for Teachers and Principals*. Reston, Va.: Council for Exceptional Children, 1977.
- Reynolds, M. C., ed. *Futures of Education for Exceptional Students: Emerging Structures*. Minneapolis: National Support Systems Project, 1978.
- Roos, P. "A Parent's View of What Education Should Accomplish." In *Educational Programming for the Severely and Profoundly Handicapped*, edited by E. Sontag, J. Smith, and N. Certo. Reston, Va.: Council for Exceptional Children, 1977.
- Weintraub, F. J., and Abeson, A. "New Education Policies for the Handicapped: The Quiet Revolution." *Phi Delta Kappan* 55 (April, 1974): 526-529.

Fastback Titles

(Continued from back cover)

85. Getting It All Together: Confluent Education
86. Silent Language in the Classroom
87. Multiethnic Education: Practices and Promises
88. How a School Board Operates
89. What Can We Learn from the Schools of China?
90. Education in South Africa
91. What I've Learned About Values Education
92. The Abuses of Standardized Testing
93. The Uses of Standardized Testing
94. What the People Think About Their Schools: Gallup's Findings
95. Defining the Basics of American Education
96. Some Practical Laws of Learning
97. Reading 1967-1977: A Decade of Change and Promise
98. The Future of Teacher Power in America
99. Collective Bargaining in the Public Schools
100. How To Individualize Learning
101. Winchester: A Community School for the Urbanvantaged
102. Affective Education in Philadelphia
103. Teaching with Film
104. Career Education: An Open Door Policy
105. The Good Mind
106. Law in the Curriculum
107. Fostering a Pluralistic Society Through Multi-Ethnic Education
108. Education and the Brain
109. Bonding: The First Basic in Education
110. Selecting Instructional Materials
111. Teacher Improvement Through Clinical Supervision
112. Places and Spaces: Environmental Psychology in Education
113. Artists as Teachers
114. Using Role Playing in the Classroom
115. Management by Objectives in the Schools
116. Declining Enrollments: A New Dilemma for Educators
117. Teacher Centers—Where, What, Why?
118. The Case for Competency-Based Education
119. Teaching the Gifted and Talented
120. Parents Have Rights, Too!
121. Student Discipline and the Law
122. British Schools and Ours
123. Church-State Issues in Education
124. Mainstreaming: Merging Regular and Special Education
125. Early Field Experiences in Teacher Education
126. Student and Teacher Absenteeism
127. Writing Centers in the Elementary School
128. A Primer on Piaget

This fastback and others in the series are made available at low cost through the contributions of the Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, established in 1966 with a bequest by George H. Reavis. The foundation exists to promote a better understanding of the nature of the educative process and the relation of education to human welfare. It operates by subsidizing authors to write fastbacks and monographs in nontechnical language so that beginning teachers and the general public may gain a better understanding of educational problems. Contributions to the endowment should be addressed to the Educational Foundation, Phi Delta Kappa, Eighth and Union, Box 789, Bloomington, IN 47402.

All 128 fastbacks (not including 84S) can be purchased for \$46 (\$39 to Phi Delta Kappa members).

Single copies of fastbacks are 75¢ (60¢ to members).

Other quantity discounts for any title or combination of titles are:

Number of copies	Nonmember price	Member price
10—24	48¢/copy	45¢/copy
25—99	45¢/copy	42¢/copy
100—499	42¢/copy	39¢/copy
500—999	39¢/copy	36¢/copy
1,000 or more	36¢/copy	33¢/copy

Prices are subject to change without notice.

A \$1 handling fee will be charged on orders under \$5 if payment is not enclosed. Indiana residents add 4% sales tax.

Order from PHI DELTA KAPPA, Eighth and Union, Box 789, Bloomington, IN 47402.

PDK Fastback Titles Now Available

1. Schools Without Property Taxes: Hope or Illusion?
2. The Best Kept Secret of the Past 5,000 Years: Women Are Ready for Leadership in Education
3. Open Education: Promise and Problems
4. Performance Contracting: Who Profits Most?
5. Too Many Teachers: Fact or Fiction?
6. How Schools Can Apply Systems Analysis
7. Busing: A Moral Issue
8. Discipline or Disaster?
9. Learning Systems for the Future
10. Who Should Go to College?
11. Alternative Schools in Action
12. What Do Students Really Want?
13. What Should the Schools Teach?
14. How To Achieve Accountability in the Public Schools
15. Needed: A New Kind of Teacher
16. Information Sources and Services in Education
17. Systematic Thinking About Education
18. Selecting Children's Reading
19. Sex Differences in Learning To Read
20. Is Creativity Teachable?
21. Teachers and Politics
22. The Middle School: Whence? What? Whither?
23. Publish: Don't Perish
24. Education for a New Society
25. The Crisis in Education is Outside the Classroom
26. The Teacher and the Drug Scene
27. The Liveliest Seminar in Town
28. Education for a Global Society
29. Can Intelligence Be Taught?
30. How To Recognize a Good School
31. In Between: The Adolescent's Struggle for Independence
32. Effective Teaching in the Desegregated School
33. The Art of Followership (What Happened to the Indians?)
34. Leaders Live with Crises
35. Marshalling Community Leadership to Support the Public Schools
36. Preparing Educational Leaders: New Challenges and New Perspectives
37. General Education: The Search for a Rationale
38. The Humane Leader
39. Parliamentary Procedure: Tool of Leadership
40. Aphorisms on Education
41. Metrication, American Style
42. Optional Alternative Public Schools
43. Motivation and Learning in School
44. Informal Learning
45. Learning Without a Teacher
46. Violence in the Schools: Causes and Remedies
47. The School's Responsibility for Sex Education
48. Three Views of Competency-Based Teacher Education: I Theory
49. Three Views of Competency-Based Teacher Education: II University of Houston
50. Three Views of Competency-Based Teacher Education: III University of Nebraska
51. A University for the World: The United Nations Plan
52. Oikos, the Environment and Education
53. Transpersonal Psychology in Education
54. Simulation Games for the Classroom
55. School Volunteers: Who Needs Them?
56. Equity in School Financing: Full State Funding
57. Equity in School Financing: District Power Equalizing
58. The Computer in the School
59. The Legal Rights of Students
60. The Word Game: Improving Communications
61. Planning the Rest of Your Life
62. The People and Their Schools: Community Participation
63. The Battle of the Books: Kanawha County
64. The Community as Textbook
65. Students Teach Students
66. The Pros and Cons of Ability Grouping
67. A Conservative Alternative School: The A- School in Cupertino
68. How Much Are Our Young People Learning? The Story of the National Assessment
69. Diversity in Higher Education: Reform in the Colleges
70. Dramatics in the Classroom: Making Lessons Come Alive
71. Teacher Centers and Inservice Education
72. Alternatives to Growth: Education for a Stable Society
73. Thomas Jefferson and the Education of a New Nation
74. Three Early Champions of Education: Benjamin Franklin, Benjamin Rush, and Noah Webster
75. A History of Compulsory Education Laws
76. The American Teacher: 1776-1976
77. The Urban School Superintendency: A Century and a Half of Change
78. Private Schools: From the Puritans to the Present
79. The People and Their Schools
80. Schools of the Past: A Treasury of Photographs
81. Sexism: New Issue in American Education
82. Computers in the Curriculum
83. The Legal Rights of Teachers
84. Learning in Two Languages
- 84S. Learning in Two Languages (Spanish edition)

(Continued on inside back cover)

See inside back cover for prices.